

**REMARKS**

Claims 9-12, 15, 16, 18, 19, and 21-26 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 9-12 have been indicated as having allowable subject matter.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 15, 16, 18, 19, and 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,369 by Sheen (“Sheen”), and Claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Sheen and U.S. Patent No. 5,061,925 by Sooch et al. (“Sooch”). Insofar as they may be applied against the claims, these rejections have been overcome.

The Examiners asserts at pages 5, 6, and 8 that Sheen (and not Sooch) discloses a “calibration system” at column 5, lines 1-12. For the Examiner’s convenience, the paragraph at column 5, lines 1-12, is reproduced below:

Data stored in the DAC model is preferably derived from the particular DAC 216 that the circuit 200 employs. Preferably, a calibration routine is executed at run-time, and behavioral information about the DAC is automatically measured and stored in the DAC model 220. The calibration routine is preferably executed on a regular basis, or on demand, to ensure high accuracy in spite of drift in the characteristics of the DAC over time and temperature. Alternatively, behavioral information can be extracted from the DAC 216 during a one-time characterization and permanently stored in a non-volatile memory accessible to the DAC model.

While the term “calibration routine” is used and while there is emphasis that a “calibration routine” is preferred, nowhere in this paragraph (or anywhere else in Sheen) is there disclosure of using a calibration signal, let alone a calibration signal that is substantially free of in-band frequencies.

There is so little specificity in Sheen, in fact, that it is not clear how one would be able to perform this calibration routine based solely on the four corners of Sheen. Clearly, Sheen cannot and does not anticipate any of Claims 15, 16, 18, 19, and 21-26, nor can any of these claims be rendered obvious because no other references of record disclose this feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 15, 16, 18, 19, and 21-26 be withdrawn and that Claim 15, 16, 18, 19, and 21-26 be allowed.

**Conclusion**

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 9-12, 15, 16, 18, 19, and 21-26.

Applicants do not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

DOCKET NO.  
TI-34411

PATENT APPLICATION  
SERIAL NO. 10/724,817

Should the Examiner require any further clarification to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John J. Patti/

Dated: October 5, 2009

John J. Patti  
Reg. No. 57,191  
Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
Phone: (972)917-4144